

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/789,526	02/26/2004	Kenneth W. Dobie	BIOL0002US	9932	
55389 KNORRE MA	7590 06/28/2007 ARTENS, OLSON & BE	EXAMINER			
2040 MAIN STREET			EPPS FORD, JANET L		
FOURTEENTI IRVINE, CA 9			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1633		
			•		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Applicat	tion No.	Applicant(s)		
		526	DOBIE, KENNETH		
Office Action Summary	Examine	er ·	Art Unit		
		Epps-Ford	1633		
The MAILING DATE of this communeriod for Reply	nication appears on the	he cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisio after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cor  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for rep  - Any reply received by the Office later than three month  - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF T ns of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nmunication. statutory period will apply and ly will, by statute, cause the ar	THIS COMMUNICATION EVENT, however, may a reply be tin will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from polication to become ABANDONE	N.  nely filed  the mailing date of this con D (35 U.S.C. \$ 133)		
Status					
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) for 2a) This action is FINAL.</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practice.</li> </ul>	2b)∏ This action is n for allowance excep	non-final. ot for formal matters, pro		merits is	
Disposition of Claims			•		
4)	are withdrawn from c 50-68 is/are rejected	onsideration.			
Application Papers			,		
9) The specification is objected to by the specification is objected to by the specific spec	e: a) ☐ accepted or bection to the drawing(s)  ng the correction is requ	be held in abeyance. See ired if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFF		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/789,526

Art Unit: 1633

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

1. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 13, 20-23, 46-47, 50-57, and new claims 58-68 are pending for examination.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

# Response to Arguments

- 3. The rejection of claim 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 20-23, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dobie et al. (US Patent Application 2003-232438), is withdraw in response to Applicant's amendment filed 2-27-07.
- 4. The rejection of claims 3-7, 9, 11-13, and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment filed 2-27-07.
- 5. The rejection of claims 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment filed 2-27-07.

# Double Patenting

- 6. Claims 1, 3-6, 13, 20-23, 46-47, 50-57 remain provisionally rejected, and new claims 58-68 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15, 17-23 of copending Application No. 10/927,466 in view of Dobie et al., for the reasons of record.
- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 2-27-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the instant rejection on the grounds that,

Application/Control Number: 10/789,526

Art Unit: 1633

consistent with MPEP § 804, Applicants respectfully requested that the

Page 3

"remaining provisional double patenting rejection be withdrawn and the instant

Application be allowed to issue." However, contrary to Applicant's assertions, the

instant provisional double patenting rejection is not the only remaining rejection

of record in the instant application, see the following new grounds of rejection set

forth below.

8. Claim 58 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial

duplicate of claim 13. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else

are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight

difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as

being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in

the United States.

10. Claim 1, 4-6, 20, and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticiapted by Olek et al. (WO 2001077384 A2 (German); Passages cited as set

forth in English translation of this document US 2004023279).

Olek et al. discloses the sequence:

<210> SEQ ID NO 257516

<211> LENGTH: 13

<212> TYPE: DNA

<213> ORGANISM: Artificial Sequence

<220> FEATURE:

<223> OTHER INFORMATION: Oligonucleotide for detection of SNP

TSC0062661

<400> SEQUENCE: 257516

**Tttctttccattc** 

The underlined nucleotide sequence set forth above represents a 12 consecutive nucleobase portion of SEQ ID NO: 19 of the instant application. SEQ ID NO: 257516 of Olek et al. is at least 90% complementary to SEQ ID NO: 4 of the instant application. Moreover, the nucleic acid based compounds of Olek et al. are oligonucleotides or peptide nucleic acid oligomers and are useful in methods for the detection of cytosine methylation and single nucleotide polymorphisms.

11. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (WO 99/65928A2).

Roberts et al. discloses SEQ ID NO: 630 (see page 75), which is an oligonucleotide of 10 nucleobases in length, wherein said oligonucleotide is 100% complementary to SEQ ID NO: 4, and wherein said oligonucleotide consists of a 10 consecutive nucleobase portion of SEQ ID NO: 19 (nucleobases 1-10) of the instant application. The invention of Roberts et al. also encompasses wherein the oligonucleotide sequence disclosed on page 75 of the reference can be used to design an antisense RNA to these sequences or to their complements, see the following:

In addition to the sequences shown in Tables 1 and 2, this invention also provides the anti-sense polynucleotide stand, e.g. antisense RNA to these

sequences or their complements. One can synthesize an antisense RNA based on the sequences provided in the Tables using any methods available in the art,

(see bridging paragraph of pages 19-20).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 13. Claims 1, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olek et al. in view of Bennett et al. (US Patent No. 5,968, 748).

The scope of the instant claims encompass a compound according to claim 1 further comprising at least one phosphorothioate modified internucleoside linkage, 5-methylcytosine nucleobase, modified sugar, or combination thereof, wherein the modified sugar is a 2'-O(2-methoxyethyl).

The teaching of Olek et al. set forth above, is incorporated here. However, Olek et al. does not teach oligonucleotide compositions comprising phosphorothioate internucleoside modifications, 5-methylcytosine modifications, or 2'-O(2-methylethyl) sugar modifications.

Bennett et al. teach the modification of antisense oligonucleotides with at least one phosphorothioate modified internucleoside linkage, a 5-methylcytosine nucleobase, and a modified sugar, or combination thereof, wherein the modified sugar is a 2'-O(2-methoxyethyl) (col. 7, lines 1 and 60-62). Bennett et al. teach

that such modified or substituted oligonucleotides are often preferred over native forms because of desirable properties such as, for example, enhanced cellular uptake, enhanced binding to target and increased stability in the presence of nucleases (col. 6, lines 58-62).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time of the instant invention to modify the oligonucleotides of Olek et al. with at least one phosphorothioate internucleoside linkage, 5-methylcytosine modifications, and at least one sugar according to the present invention. One of ordinary skill in the art seeking to design oligonucleotides comprising an increased half-life, and increased effective concentration, would have been motivated to modify the oligonucleotides of Olek et al. to comprise the modifications of Bennett et al., since these modifications increase nuclease resistance, and increase the binding affinity of the oligonucleotide for its complementary sequence

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 14. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 15. Claims 46-47, 60, and 64-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 46 and those claims dependent therefrom, claims 47, 60, and 64-68, recite the limitation "an antisense oligonucleotide comprising *a nucleobase* sequence of SEQ ID NO: 19." The scope of the phrase "a nucleobase sequence of SEQ IDNO: 19," as recited in the context of this claim is vague and indefinite

since it lacks sufficient antecedent basis in claim 1. Claim 1 is limited to wherein the claimed compound comprises "an at least 8 consecutive nucleobase portion of SEQ ID NO: 19." The scope of dependent claim 46, is broader in scope than independent claim 1, therefore claim 46 also fails to further limit claim 1.

#### Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet L. Epps-Ford whose telephone number is 571-272-0757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:00 AM through 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach can be reached on 571-272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Janet L. Epps-Ford/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1633